THE

MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. VI.] BOSTON, MARCH, 1865. [No. 3.

TERRESTRIAL AND CELESTIAL GLORY ILLUSTRATED IN THE CAREER OF EDWARD EVERETT.

Extracts from a Sermon preached on the Sunday after the funeral of Mr. Everett.

By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

[At the request of many persons, I print a part of a sermon on Mr. Everett, which, while giving due honor to his great worth, does not omit to mention his defects and failures. Such a view, in our judgment, does more honor to a man than any pure eulogium can give. Unmixed praise leaves a suspicion of doubt and a feeling of unreality. A faultless man is a monster which the world never saw. Consequently, a careful estimate of both sides of a human life leaves us often with more respect for its subject, than unmeasured eulogy.

The text of the discourse was from Paul: "The glory of the celestial is one; and the glory of the terrestrial is another." After describing the two kinds of glory, the discourse goes on as follows:—]

SOMETIMES, however, we see the two glories united in one person, as in the case of that eminent citizen whose recent death has called out such a universal expression of sympathy, not only in our own community, but through the whole land. The largest part of Mr. Everett's life was that of the successful scholar, orator, public man. It was radiant with the highest kind of terrestrial glory. Nothing more perfect than his *suave* and brilliant eloquence; nothing more happy than his adroit allusions. His tongue

dropt manna; and so ingenious was his carefully arranged discourse, that expectation sat on the waiting audience, and was never disappointed of its charming surprises. And yet, perfect as all this was, it was a purely terrestrial eloquence, or seemed so. It was the most perfect kind of mechanism, but still mechanical, — like the most ingenious musical box from a Genevese workshop; carolling like a bird, but still not a bird, but a musical box. So that many persons used to say of Mr. Everett, that he was eloquent, to be sure; no doubt a great orator, but a cold man, a timid man, a selfish man. They said there was no enthusiasm about him, no spark of generosity, only artificial grace and charm. I even recollect that the New-York "Evening Post" once applied to him Milton's description of Belial (in which I have always thought Milton was describing the oratory of Wentworth, Earl of Strafford): —

> "On the other side uprose
> Belial, in act more graceful and humane.
> A fairer person lost not heaven. He seemed
> For dignity composed, and high exploit;
> But all was false and hollow, — to nobler deeds
> Timorous and slothful; yet he pleased the ear."

And, indeed, had it not been for this civil war, we should never have seen that higher glory of Mr. Everett's life, because of which the country to-day collects in spirit around his recent grave; because of which the popular heart met him with its honest ardor and manly gratitude; because of which, in a thousand churches, the ministers of the gospel do not think it apart from their office to call attention to his life and spirit.

I am not about to pronounce his eulogy. Eulogies are always distasteful to me. I have neither time, ability, nor disposition for it. By the side of an open grave, before a human being in his coffin, extravagant praise or unmeas-

ured admiration seems strangely out of season. Nor am I about to criticise Mr. Everett's career, to analyze his intellect, weigh his genius, or pronounce judgment on his life and work. Let others who are able do this. I wish only to call attention to one great moral which this event says to us all.

We say a man's life has been successful; but there are two kinds of success. There is what a man succeeds in *doing*, and what he succeeds in *becoming*, — his accomplishment and his character. His life may be looked at as a work of art, according to its results; or it may be considered as a struggle, a battle, a heroic endeavor, according to its motive and aim. The one is its terrestrial glory; the other, its celestial.

Now, the first kind of success is that to which attention is almost always called. Admiration and eulogy are lavished on the successful statesman, soldier, artist, writer, speaker, — on the man who has achieved position, power, renown. Young men are invited to honor and imitate the great orator, the great financier, the victorious general, the popular statesman. We are apt to call their attention to *this* kind of success, and to say to them, "Study the qualities which led to such advancement. See how industrious, how prudent, how cautious, he was; see with what rare sagacity he avoided all mistakes, always did the popular thing, always chose the winning side; see how he studied what was expedient, and so, step by step, rose from one position of power and fame to another. Now, imitate him; do as he did; be practical, and you will be successful." We may not say all this in words; but we say it far more strongly when we show that we honor above all things the glitter of outward accomplishment and outward popularity.

Now, in Mr. Everett's instance, we have an example of

both kinds of success. His life was almost perfect as a work of art; and he commands our respect by the pure and noble efforts of his last years in behalf of his country. He succeeded both ways; but which was the greater? If we were obliged to choose, for him or for ourselves, his long career of self-advancement and honor, or his brief period of unconditional service to his country, which was its own reward; his fifty years of fame or his four years of self-sacrifice; would we not choose the last? The one is the glory of the terrestrial; but the other is the glory of the celestial.

Mr. Everett was an artist, and his life a work of art; and, all that he did, he did artistically. We are apt to think that no one is an artist who does not paint pictures, carve statues, or write music. But the essence of art is beautiful finish, perfect work. Any thing finished perfectly produces the effect of art. The Greeks, among all nations, have been the most artistic. Every thing they said or did took perfect shape; and so it was no accident that Mr. Everett, our great New-England artist in speech, should have been one of our first and best Greek scholars.

I can just recollect hearing him preach, one Christmas Day, in the Stone Chapel. I was very young; and, as the house was crowded, I sat on the highest pulpit-stair, and yet remember the graceful movements of the speaker's arm, as he waved it in the air above my head. He was as perfect and polished an orator then as ever; and the church was so full, that people stood, filling the aisles full, close up to the pulpit: a thing so unusual in that venerable edifice, that I think it must have been somewhat surprised itself at the number it contained. But Mr. Everett's oratory was always a perfect piece of art. Every thing in it was carefully arranged beforehand, — nothing spontaneous. I have sometimes watched him to see how he

produced his effects; standing as it were behind the scenes, and not letting myself be carried away with the enthusiasm of the audience; keeping cool, in order to criticise. But I never could succeed in permanently keeping this position. Something would come at last so exquisitely happy as to carry me off my feet with the rest. This was glory; but, after all, only terrestrial, — not celestial. The danger is, that young men, to whom it is natural to admire this sort of success, should not perceive, that, by itself, it is inadequate. And therefore I will call your attention to the fact, that, though so eminently successful in life by means of this great talent so greatly cultivated, of foresight, prudence, skill, the only *failures* of Mr. Everett were due to this same faculty. He not only succeeded by being a perfect artist, and making his life a work of art, but he failed also, when he failed, by an excess of art; by the absence of spontaneity; by looking so much at the prudent and expedient as to fail in enthusiasm; by not rashly following truth and justice sometimes when they seemed inexpedient.

What were his failures? He failed, on the whole, as President of the University, notwithstanding his many eminent qualifications for that office. He failed; that is, compared with what was expected from him. And why? Because he did not understand boyhood and youth; having never been a boy himself. He could not sympathize with the young men, nor make allowance for their elastic, buoyant natures. Every petty fault seemed to him grave and intentional. There was therefore a want of moral perspective in his government. All offences — those against etiquette, and those against the moral law — seemed alike grave. And, as he did not understand the boys, the boys did not understand him, and did him great injustice in their opinion. He never really was able to influence

them; and this was because of his great artistic tendency being no way qualified by any spontaneity.

So, again, he failed, on the whole, in Congress. This was for the same reason. He was too consummate an artist. He had not the ready gift of sudden speech, the genial emotion, the off-hand utterance, which gave such men as Henry Clay the command of those halls.

But the greatest of all his mistakes, and the one for which he most bitterly suffered, was his opposition to the antislavery movement, which, to his critical eye, seemed unwise, inexpedient, and dangerous to the Union. Therefore it was that he went the length of defending slavery on the floor of the House of Representatives, and drew on himself the terrible rebuke of John Randolph, "I envy neither the head nor the heart of a Northern man who can defend slavery on principle." So he made the mistake, when Governor of the Commonwealth, of suggesting that a law be passed, making antislavery agitation a criminal offence. So also, when Charles Sumner was struck down, he declined attending the meeting held in Boston to express indignation at that cowardly and murderous assault; saying that he had done with public meetings. What Mr. Everett declined to do in Boston, Henry Wilson did on the floor of the Senate in the face of the ruffians themselves, stigmatizing the assault as brutal, cowardly, and murderous. And I call the attention of young men, who think the best part of Mr. Everett was his wisdom, that the brave, incautious, inexpedient speech of Henry Wilson was the wiser of the two; and that, for just such things as these, the people of Massachusetts have again returned him to the Senate: for the people *never* forget manliness, and devotion to the right.

Some one will say, "Why refer to these mistakes? Let the dead bury their dead. Say nothing of the dead but

what is good." But I, remembering the Latin saying, "De mortuis nil nisi bonum," prefer the other, "De mortuis nil nisi *verum*," Say nothing of the dead but what is *true*.

It is not as a reproach that I mention these things. Mr. Everett has made ample atonement for them all. In these last days, when he forgot himself, forgot his antecedents, forgot all selfish and personal interest, and gave himself to spend and be spent, in season and out of season, for his country; when he left off being an *artist*, and became a *man*, — he fully atoned for every error; and a magnanimous people opened its arms of love to receive him to its heart of hearts. When at Gettysburg he delivered his memorial oration over the heroic graves of our soldiers who fell saving their country from a relapse into the barbarous aristocracy of past centuries, and also making a Christian democracy triumphant, he said of himself these noble words of confession, "I also so feared civil war, that I may myself have gone too far in the past, in concession to the South, and compromise with slavery." That confession, so manly and generous, not only redeemed the past, but showed that his past course did not come from selfishness, but from a too-cautious conscience; that he always was meaning, even when most mistaken, to do his duty. His defect was an excess of timidity; but we now see that it was not a *selfish* timidity, but a *conscientious* timidity.

Thus times like these try men's souls. The sheep go to the right, and the goats to the left. We see what men always have been. And now, for the first time, we really understand Edward Everett, and see that he was not only the consummate orator, the most perfect artist America ever produced, but that he was always at heart a *man;* that he was a real democrat, a true lover of freedom, a

conscientious man, meaning to do his duty. I have told you how I heard him first, when I was a little boy; hearing him preach a Christmas sermon on the hopes of Christ's coming. The last time I heard him speak was as an elector in the Massachusetts Electoral College, saying, "I give my vote for Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States for four years from the 4th of March, 1865." I felt how noble was this act, — one of the noblest of his life. To have forgotten all party association; to have left so many old friendships; and finally, in his absorbing patriotism, to throw his vote for the man of whom he had been a rival candidate only four years before, — *that*, I felt, was nobler than all his great literary renown, all his proud oratorical achievements; and that these four years of simple, honest patriotism were worth all the fifty previous years of triumphant artistic success. "*For the glory of the terrestrial is one; but the glory of the celestial, another.*"

AXIOMS, OPPORTUNITIES, DIFFICULTIES, DUTIES.

No rich Christian life can exist where there is no charitable action; and no body of Christians can prosper who do not, as a body, engage in large common charities. We assume that these axioms will not be disputed. We have no disposition, however, to compare or contrast our Christian charities, as a denomination, a class of Christians, with those of other denominations, or classes of Christians. We should not anxiously inquire what others do, but, rather, "What has God given us to do? What has he summoned us to perform? Which way lies the field, and where can we enter it?" These should be

our most earnest and anxious inquiries. He has committed to us the gospel of Christian freedom. We are to proclaim liberty to the captives, not only to those bound in chains, but to those bound in creeds; not only to those imprisoned by tyrants, but to those imprisoned by priests; not only to those barred in dungeons, but to those barred in churches. We are to proclaim that liberty which comes to every soul from willing obedience to God's law, as revealed in the soul and in the word. That law authorizes, not license, but liberty; not irreverence, but respect.

We must not be startled at some things which are erratic, irreverent, scornful. When blind eyes are opened, it will sometimes happen that the patient will "see men as trees walking." It will sometimes happen, that, when paralyzed limbs are restored, men will "leap" as well as "walk" while they praise God. Danger of excess is the peril of freedom: extravagance in speculation and action often attend it. He who fears that God's adamantine temple of truth will fall because some men, when their fetters break, butt their heads against its walls, has not walked round about it, and measured its walls, and numbered its towers. Not the solid chrysolite, but the madman's head, demands our sympathy.

We do not mean to say, that our ears are not sometimes pained and our hearts grieved with irreverent expressions which fall from rash lips. In all periods of great mental activity, of reforms in society, there are rash speculators found, who ignorantly do infinite mischief to the very cause which they would sustain and advance. The history of the world is a perpetual witness to this phenomena. He is a very simple-minded man who does not expect it. The most extravagant speculations are advanced, the wildest theories broached, the most impracticable schemes adopted, when any great work occupies the thoughts of

men. Not in theology only is this true: science is as full of heresies as theology; as many fanatical schemers and castle-builders can be found in academies of science as in schools of theology. But who fears that the great facts of science — the phenomena of earth and sky — are to be overthrown, proved lies, by these bold, restless speculators? No reasonable man. So in theology. Some men, however, fear that the everlasting gospel will disappear under the blows of the rude iconoclasts or bold critics who assail its text, — fear that the victory will be with error, not with truth, — fear that the everlasting word will become a falsehood, and Church and faith go down into the abyss together. We have no such fear. We do not even lament that the strength of the structure of the Church is to be tested. The gates even of hell cannot prevail against it, much less the puny strength of human wit and arm.

Besides, there are no more men whom we call eccentric, rash, irreverent, among us as a denomination, than among other denominations. Why, the Presbyterians look upon the Beechers — we beg pardon of the elect tribe — with greater horror than any of us look upon any of our so-called heretics. Furthermore, there is no desire, on the part of our so-called heretics, to solicit or accept the patronage of the American Unitarian Association, in the dissemination of their speculations, any more than there is of the Beechers to have the Tract Society publish and patronize their speculations. It would be quite as wise for Dr. Spring's society in New York to refuse co-operation with the Tract Society because the Beechers are members of it, as for any of our societies to refuse co-operation with the Unitarian Association because some men are members thereof, and give money to it, whose theology is decidedly distasteful to them, and perhaps to even most of us. Wisdom does not dictate desertion of a

cause, but still more efficient action, if error is abroad, and iniquity abounds.

We know it is objected that there are pestilent heretics in the Association, and co-operation is therefore impossible. Grant, for the sake of the argument, that it is true. We accept the averment, if you please, in word and spirit as made. What then? What is to be done about it? Certainly till these heretics, so called, have attempted some change, overthrow, perversion, destruction, of the Association, it is not just or Christian to suspect them of any design to act otherwise than as fraternally with us, — feeling that we are doing much good, and willing to help us do it in our own way. We believe such is their wish and purpose, if any such there are among us and of us, as has been said. They are not in the way of our free action, nor do they wish to be, so far as we are able to judge by any words or signs or acts. There is no reason, then, why any one should decline support to the Association.

The present upheaving of society, in all departments, opens new and rich opportunity for us to work. The question of human rights and human relations is discussed as it never was before. The heart is stirred as it never was before in view of human rights. The land rocks and blood runs because man is denied those rights, — because freedom is outraged. Deliverance will come. Every heart, every hand, demands it. It is proclaimed in the crack of the rifle, in the peal of the trumpet, in the thunder of artillery. Who thinks that its demands will cease when the iron fetters are broken, the iron chains fall? No one. If the knotted lash may not score the body to its task, may the scourge of excommunication drive Christ's child from the church door, the communion table? Shall men hedge up the way of the Lord, bind heavy burdens which gall the shoulders and crush the heart, and no voice

of remonstrance be raised, — no cry of oppression sound through the land? Never! Now, even now, in all the ranks of men in arms, in all communities where human rights are discussed, the minds of men are beginning to question the right, and the hearts of men to rebel against its exercise, of making man's speculations, and not God's word, the test of citizenship in the Christian commonwealth. It is this activity of the human mind which opens to us such a rich and promising field of action. The worst features of the old theology will as surely go down before the desolating storm of this terrible war as the worst doctrines of the old politics. We shall be false to ourselves, to our fellow-men, to the Master, to the Father of all, unless we arise to a just conception of our great work, and gird ourselves to perform it with the whole armor of God. To do this work, we do not say well, but to do it all, there must be united action. One society cannot act here, and another there, without any co-operation, with any efficiency. Money would be wasted; labor would be lost. We have an association by which all can work together to one end. We have wealth, we have disposition, for the most part; but we fear co-operation. This fear we must overcome, or we can do nothing effectively outside of our own societies. There is moisture enough in the atmosphere in a drought. It needs condensation: then the barren pastures will become luxuriant, the drooping vines will become erect, and the dry streams will flow with full banks. It seems as if a little interchange of opinion, very slight conference, would convince us all, if there are unbelievers, that we cannot do the work that we are called to do by the providence of God at this time, without cordial, active, earnest co-operation. With that co-operation we could do much, — do nobly our part in the world's enlightenment and redemption.

To aid in this new activity and co-operation, the Association now calls upon the churches to contribute more largely than they have ever contributed before. We ask confidently, because our cause is worthy, and the demand pressing. What is given will be distributed by the Executive Committee with their best wisdom. We shall be careful not to sow precious seed on a rock. There are enough sure methods of action to exhaust all our resources, without indulging in experiments. The gifts of the churches will be sacred trusts. The more generous your gifts, brethren, the more solicitously shall we strive to wisely dispense them. And we confidently appeal to the charitable sympathies of the churches to respond, so that all hearts shall be glad, and a new era be inaugurated in our labors to advance the Master's kingdom by the spread of his truth.

THE JOURNAL OF A CANDIDATE.

(Continued.)

MALDEN, April 19, 1864.

IT seems that I am not to have a call from the —— society; for, when the legal parish meeting took place, a motion in my favor was almost unanimously laid upon the table. The people there have been making diligent inquiries concerning me, for which I honor them; and, as I am found to be at once too conservative and too radical, both the extreme parties into which the little parish is divided are disposed to vote me down. I lost the radical support because I value the rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, wish to have the Preparatory Lecture

continued, and pray in the name of Christ. The Conservatives charge me with personal intimacies with rationalistic ministers, and an unwillingness to make correctness of doctrinal belief the supreme test of fellowship, being carried away with preferences for a very indefinite "unity of the spirit in the bond of peace." All these charges are substantially true; but, although my views have thus cost me a parish, I am not sorry that they were canvassed even to be practically condemned. Too many candidates conceal their theological tendencies until they have obtained the suffrages of men of opposite convictions, each of whom supposes that he is securing a representative of his own ideas. Alexander was never more truly great than when he said, "I would rather have to lament my fortune than to be ashamed of my victory."

April 20, 1864.

The unexpected result at —— has led me to review my position; and, the more I consider it, the better I like it.

My radical friends and foes cannot overcome my fondness for some of the ancient rites and phrases of the Christian Church. If I were more of a philosopher, I presume that I might thrive upon a thin diet of abstractions; but, as it is, my taste for incarnations is too strong to be resisted or concealed. It is hard for me to think, easy for me to love; and therefore the main objects of my faith must be persons rather than ideas. I find more of God in Jesus Christ than in all the world besides; and whatever of the divine I have discovered elsewhere has been chiefly through his help and sympathy. Starting with the trust in the love of an Almighty Father, which Jesus teaches and illustrates, I can conquer many painful doubts that might otherwise prevent my attaining to

serene and victorious faith in the righteous government of the universe. Remembering how my Master proclaimed and practised the brotherhood of mankind, I am moved to a recognition of the equality of human rights, and the worth of immortal beings, which no studies or speculations of my own would have made so complete and abiding. But for the spirit of Christ, indeed, I should be tempted to adopt this selfish view of Rénan's: "Intellectual elevation will always be the property of the few: if these few are at liberty to develop themselves freely, they will give themselves little concern as to the way the rest fashion God after their own proportion." Jesus is my best image of what is at once most godly and most manly; and every day that I live I pronounce his name with a more grateful reverence. It is not that I would have any servile uniformity in the precise place where that dear name shall occur in our devotions. From Stanley's Eastern Church, I learn, that "in the West, even in Unitarian liturgies, it is deemed almost essential that every prayer should be closed 'through Jesus Christ.' In the East, such a close is rarely, if ever, found." Still, the studied and pains-taking omission of all reference to Jesus in some modern acts of praise and prayer impresses me as a childish, if not a criminal way of protesting against the extravagance of claims made in his behalf. I would sooner slight the mother that bore me.

That the Lord's Supper is sometimes administered in a formal and heartless manner which is offensive to spiritual sincerity is a reason for rescuing it from the hands of hirelings and hypocrites, but no reason at all for its discontinuance. Most of the arguments against the rite are equally fatal to the marriage ceremony, and to every form of public worship. There is an ultra-spiritualism which I could not profess without being guilty of gross affectation.

Until I am furnished with wings, I expect to touch the earth occasionally, even in my pilgrimage to heaven. As one of the common people, I confess that I need to have invisible ideas symbolized in some outward form; but they bear false witness against their brethren, who assert that we care only for what is outward. It is in the interest and in the very spirit of materialism, that the Lord's Supper is sneered at as "baker's bread and grocer's wine." A man to whom it can be made nothing more must consider a wedding ring as only a quarter of an ounce of yellow metal, and a father's portrait a pound or two of paint on a square yard of canvas. As suggestive of the dearest commemoration and the most sacred communion, this ordinance can be made the means of quickening the best emotions of the human soul; and he must be singularly rich in gifts of the spirit to whom it is really a hinderance.

That it is such an ancient practice, and has been so highly prized by those who have gone before us in days when there were no telegraphs, locomotives, and cylinder presses, does not make me inclined to give it up. Elijah of old made a very poor prayer under the juniper-tree, when he cried, "O Lord! take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers;" and the youngest American should shrink from verifying the remark of Moreau: "Nobody is now respected if he is above eighteen years of age."

In holding that some visible pledge of faith, and of fellowship too, is of vital importance, if we would have an enduring Church of the people, I do not deny that some individuals may attain to purity, loftiness, and sweetness of spirit, without the use of ordinances. The choicest members of the Society of Friends teach us this. If there is a Christian man in this country, he is John G. Whittier: if we have a Christian woman, she is Lucretia

Mott. But the existence of these lovely and exalted characters does not disprove the need of outward rites in an organized and permanent Church. Everybody admires the patriotism of that stout old Pennsylvania farmer who fought the good fight at Gettysburg in his own way, and on his personal responsibility, and it was fitting that he should receive the right hand of fellowship from the Commander-in-chief of our armies and navies; but what could we think of Mr. Lincoln's sanity, if he should adduce such instances as proving the worthlessness of banners as the rallying points and centres for organized regiments? What the flag and its associations are to the army of America, the Cross, and its tokens of the body thereon broken and the blood thereon shed, will ever be to the Church of Christ.

April 21, 1864.

Last night I came very near writing a sermon, instead of jotting down the incidents of my experience; but, as there are several more "heads" to be discussed, I think I shall go on until my mind obtains the relief that comes with expression, even when the discourse is a silent one, and is addressed principally to the writer thereof.

The Conservatives at —— are just about as unreasonable as their radical opponents. Their bigotry is not quite so offensive indeed, for narrowness culminates in an illiberal Liberal; and yet I cannot enjoy any phase of an exacting and exclusive spirit.

What if I do covet the friendship of some of the radical party? May it not be from motives that deserve no blame? My admiration does not extend to the whole class; for too many of them remind me of what Madame de Maintenon said of Louis XIV.: "I can never make him understand that humility is a Christian virtue."

There are Radicals in theology whom I honor, love, and trust, not so much on account of their intellectual candor and heroism, though these are worthy of the highest praise, as for their resemblance to the Master whom they obey and follow to an extent which puts all mere lip-service to signal shame. The claim of the advanced party to possess all the largest and most active brains of our time is by no means fully established; and, therefore, it is not clearly an idolatry of mental vigor, which betrays me into unwillingness to separate from all who reject any thing that I hold true and sacred. J. S. Mill, certainly an unbiassed witness, testifies, that, "however urgent may be the necessity for the breaking-up of old modes of belief, the most strong-minded and discerning, next to those who head the movement, are generally those who bring up the rear of it."

A man's opinions concerning miracles and records are no sure test of his spiritual sympathy with Jesus, nor do they give the measure of his fidelity to the least of Christ's brethren. If the judgment pronounced in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew is not reversed, many who are in the left wing of our denomination will reach the right hand of God; for they have heard and answered every cry of the humble. When I hear men threatening a withdrawal of fellowship on purely doctrinal grounds, with the hope of intimidating or restraining their opponents, I wonder at their ignorance of human nature and ecclesiastical history. They should have acquired more wisdom from the very old story of Jupiter and the countryman, walking together, and conversing with great freedom and familiarity on the subject of heaven and earth. "The countryman listened with attention and acquiescence while Jupiter strove only to convince him; but, happening to hint a doubt, Jupiter turned hastily round, and threatened him with his thunder.

'Ah!' said the countryman, 'now, Jupiter, I know that you are wrong: you are always wrong when you appeal to your thunder.'"

We ought to have learned, long ago, that the thunders of Protestant anathemas are weak and harmless things. Especially in a republic, where independence is our daily lesson, will it be found impossible to replace a yoke upon human intellects. Free thought, like universal suffrage, when once allowed cannot be recalled. The genii of fearless inquiry have been released from their imprisoning caskets, and neither threats nor entreaties can induce them to return to confinement. "Man and Nature" inform us that even "the crows of this generation are wiser than their ancestors. Old scarecrows are unavailing."

Nothing but evil will come of all attempts to impose arbitrary restrictions on those who are even venturesome and extravagant in their notions of freedom. Give them time to try the experiment, and all who are worth having will gradually return to sobriety and safety of speculation, instead of being confirmed in waywardness by untimely opposition. For the sake of daring spirits, sure to be goaded into still more desperate leaps if they experience the slightest interference with their rights, I would advise patience and generosity. For the sake of a still larger class who are now comparatively quiet, the same course is to be desired. A runaway horse may not wander far if turned loose upon the prairie, and roving boys often repent if you send them to sea; but needless walls are challenges to adventure, and teachers of truancy, whilst the most inveterate homebody wishes to go out the moment he hears the key turned round in the lock.

Whilst I abhor irreverence, and detest flippancy, I know even young Radicals who are as modest, as devout, as desirous of awakening an interest in the religious life, as

any men of my acquaintance. Nobody's prejudices shall alienate me from these true-hearted ones. I mean to satisfy them, that fear and bitterness and self-righteousness are not the natural fruit of my comparative conservatism. My own thoughts, like my affections, tend rather "to nestle than to roam;" but if God has given my friend the strength and sweep of wing to invade the upper air, and sail above the shoreless sea, I shall not try to have him closely clipped, and condemned to hop from perch to perch in some approved ecclesiastical aviary. Probably, if I had lived in the days of Ferdinand and Isabella, I should have been too well satisfied with the old world; but I should have tried hard to beware of the folly of thinking that Columbus *deserved* his chains.

April 25, 1864.

If I were limited to a single draught of the waters of Lethe, it should be used to forget that there are such things as dollars and cents; but every head of a family is, *ex officio*, chairman of a committee of ways and means, with no chance to decline the appointment creditably. To pay the annual premium on my life-insurance, I have had to take fifty dollars of what is left of the first instalment of the purchase money for which we sold our house. But let me remember, as a small crumb of comfort, that a few weeks since, when on board a fast train off the track, with the stove dancing itself to pieces, and my bounding neighbors wild with fright, I sat as still as I could, and congratulated myself upon the agreeable prospect, that, if nothing worse than death was at hand, this policy would make a better provision for my wife and children than my future labors in the ministry were likely to secure.

Soon after leaving the office of the New-England Mutual, in State Street, I overtook a middle-aged clergy-

man who has had to give up his policy because he cannot continue to pay the premium. Six or eight years ago, he used to boast to me of his four sons, all of whom he had dedicated to his own calling; so I asked him if the two about to leave college would enter the Cambridge Divinity School this autumn. He said, "No, neither of them. If they wished to engage in a forlorn hope, I should admire their pluck, and consent cheerfully; but I do not mean to put them up to such extra-hazardous enterprises. The ministry was never a very lucrative pursuit, but the people were once comparatively liberal. Now, while my salary, like that of nine-tenths of my brethren, is the same that it was a decade back, the butcher would stare if I offered him the old price for meat, and the grocer would laugh outright if I should tender the old prices for coffee and sugar. Preaching is about the only thing that does not cost any more than it did. Probably, it is because sermons, excepting such as Ward Beecher delivers, are so lacking in levity that they cannot be made to rise with gold. My boys must find some way to relieve their father from the humiliating necessity of asking a rich brother-in-law every six months for a hundred dollars to keep the duns away from the door of the old manse." This he said with an air of sadness: but, before bidding me good morning, a brave smile lighted up his manly face while he told that Andrew Gemmells, the original of Scott's Edie Ochiltree, on one occasion observed, that begging was in modern times scarcely the profession of a gentleman; and, if he had twenty sons, he would not easily be induced to breed one of them up in his own line.

(To be continued.)

SPACE AND TIME.

[The following valuable though brief essay was given us, at our request, some time since, and has been necessarily deferred until the articles in the "North American" may have escaped the memory of our readers. The discussion of the question of "Space and Time" is, however, quite independent of any particular space and time, and is always in order. Our readers will thank us for offering them an essay so full of insight and logic as the present. We have not struck out some strictures on the writer in the "North American," though they seem to us too severe. That gentleman we know to be a modest man; and any thing in his article which seemed otherwise was probably due merely to the depth and clearness of his own convictions. — ED.]

THE "NORTH-AMERICAN REVIEW" ON "SPACE AND TIME."

THE "North-American Review" for July last contains an article, entitled "The Philosophy of Space and Time," which took its readers by surprise, with the indications of a taste and capacity for abstruse speculation, rare at all times, and especially rare in this time and land. The essay discovers unquestionable ability in the way of philosophic disputation, and attests a well-trained and energetic mind.

But a careful perusal will somewhat abate the first impression of its merits. The ability, though great, is discursive, not intuitive; the argument is rather acute than profound, — acute in the sense of logical dexterity, not of intellectual discrimination. There is often an oppressive display of scholastic phraseology, and often a want of clearness in the statement.

But what especially displeases is the magisterial, *ex cathedra* way of handling great and reverend names. This fault is still more conspicuous in a second article by the same author in the October issue of that review, entitled "The Conditioned and the Unconditioned," in which the aim is to refute Sir William Hamilton. This the author

had an indubitable right to undertake; but would have better prospered in the undertaking without the air of superiority he has seen fit to assume. When a writer, without name or claim, talks in this from-above style of the world's acknowledged masters, he prejudices his own cause by the violence done to the sentiment of reverence in his readers. Occasionally, the lofty dictation with which he delivers his conclusions has a ludicrous effect, as when, in the paper last named, he announces that "the absolute and the infinite, therefore, far from conflicting, henceforth (!) coincide as compatible attributes, and the unnatural antinomy is for ever (!) resolved." Since the author is a reader of Kant, we recommend to him that philosopher's "*Von einem neuerdings erhobenen vornehmen Ton in der Philosophie.*"

Again: we are reminded of the pedagogue's offer to teach Elia the art of writing, when, in the July article, he says, "We must slightly modify the question which Kant proposes as the universal problem of pure reason. It should no longer (!) read, 'How are synthetical judgments *à priori* possible?' for they are not possible; but, 'How can any synthetical judgment be absolutely necessary and universal?' which is the real fact Kant means to explain." Begging the reviewer's pardon, we shall take the liberty to think that Kant meant what he said; and not only so, but that he has proved it, too. If the reviewer cannot see it, the fault is not Kant's.

Against Kant's assertion of *à priori* judgments, he argues that "all knowledge is relative; and the antithesis of a thinking subject and an object thought is the general law of its relativity." The statement is confused, and contains a fallacy. It is true, that, in every act of knowledge, subject and object must unite; but it does not follow that knowledge is relative. Knowledge is the synthesis of two corrolates: that does not make it relative. Again: he says,

"The mind cannot create objects of its own cognition: that were to suppose a pure, spontaneous mental activity, which would violate the law of the relativity of knowledge." This is reasoning in a circle. First, it is affirmed that knowledge is relative, because it requires that an object be presented to the mind; then it is claimed that an object must be presented to the mind in every act of cognition, because knowledge is relative. To say that the mind cannot create objects of its own cognition, is assuming the very point in debate. If, as Kant argues, space is merely subjective, then, so far as it can be said to be an object of cognition, it is one which the mind creates.

"Again," says the reviewer, "the proposition, 'A straight line between two points is the shortest,' is claimed by Kant as purely *à priori*, and independent of experience; but points and lines are objects of knowledge, and experience alone can furnish them." Here he confounds the visible marks which represent lines and points with the lines and points themselves. The former are furnished by experience, the latter are the mind's creation; and the proposition in question is as intelligible to a blind man as to one who sees, and might just as well originate with a blind man as with one who sees. It is strictly an *à priori* judgment. Geometry is not first learned from diagrams; the diagrams only serve to demonstrate and represent a foregone conclusion or intuition of the mind.

The reviewer says, "Nothing can be clearer than that, by the 'pure intuition of space *à priori*,' Kant means the mental image we form of empty space." Begging his pardon again, nothing can be clearer to one who apprehends the argument of the "kritik" than that Kant meant no such thing. The citations by which he attempts to prove this assertion — as, for example, "We cannot cogitate a line without drawing it in thought" — are irrelevant. A

mental image of a line is not a mental image of empty space, which is sheer absurdity. When, above all, he accuses Kant of confusing space with extension, he overlooks the very gist of Kant's argument, according to which no idea of extension is possible without the antecedent idea of space; and that is not a mental image, but, to cite the very words of the "kritik," "a necessary idea, *à priori*, which lies at the foundation of all external appearances," . . . "the subjective condition of sense under which alone external intuition is possible." — "In order," says Kant, "that certain sensations may be referred to something outside of me, — that is, to something in another region of space than that in which I am; also, in order that I may conceive them as separate, — consequently, not only different, but in different places, — the idea of space must lie already at the basis of my conception. Accordingly, the idea of space cannot be derived through experience from the relations of external appearance; but this external appearance itself is possible only by means of that idea." — *Kr. d. R. V. Von dem Raume.* 1.

We do not say that this argument is unanswerable; but we say that it is not answered nor fairly met by the writer in the "North American;" and that, on the whole, his criticism on Kant is more creditable to his self-confidence than it is to his discretion. No man is to be counted infallible, even in his own line; but there are some men — masters in philosophy — with regard to whom it is well to remember Coleridge's pithy maxim, — "Unless you are sure that you understand their ignorance, presume yourself ignorant of their understanding."

Notwithstanding these abatements, "The Philosophy of Space and Time" is still, in our judgment, the best metaphysical monograph this country has produced for many a year; and, when we consider what monstrosities have been

perpetrated in these days in the name of philosophy, it is pleasant to know that there is a writer among us in whom learning, talent, and critical acumen combine with personal predilection to constitute a real vocation for speculative science.

The doctrine so ingeniously argued in this essay — the reality of space — we have always held to be false; and are still and more than ever — after reading what the author has to say on the subject — convinced of its falsity. "Space," says the reviewer, "is an infinite unit." If infinite, then it is uncreated, self-existent, — something that would exist, not only without a world, but without a God. We have then, beside the infinite, self-existent God, another infinite, self-existent being,* — a being which God did not create, and cannot destroy. It will be difficult to make this appear other than a limitation of divine power. Of the two, we would rather, if reduced to that alternative, accept the doctrine of Samuel Clarke, which makes space an attribute of Deity, or that of Spinosa, which makes Deity an extended substance.

It is an axiom in philosophy not to admit without sufficient cause. One self-existent being we accept, as the only way of accounting for any existence whatsoever; but the argument seems to require that there be but one.

Again: space is defined by this writer as the "infinite and indivisible receptacle of extended existence." He will allow, we presume, that extended existence had a beginning. What then was space, according to this definition, before the creation of the world? A receptacle with nothing in it. A receptacle which encloses nothing, and which also excludes nothing! A thing not only inconceiv-

* Or, in fact, two; since, according to the author, what is true of space is true also of time.

able as a "mental image," but inconstruable as a logical idea.

For our own part, we hold that space is purely ideal. This seems to us the only view which does not present insuperable ontological difficulties; and, although we have not much faith in logic, we venture to offer the following brief demonstration of the proposition, that space is not a real existence.

All existences are divisible into persons, things, and, using the word a little more loosely, attributes.

1. Space is not a person: this requires no proof.

2. Space is not a thing. It is an axiom that two things cannot occupy the same place at the same time; but there is no portion of pure space where a thing may not be supposed to be. That thing being there, no other thing can be there at the same time. Consequently, space is not a thing.

3. Space is not an attribute. All attributes are either quantitative or qualitative. Space is not quantitative, inasmuch as it measures nothing; but, on the contrary, is cognizable and definable only by quantitative determination *ab extra*. Space is not a quality, — not a quality of spirit, inasmuch as the attribution of space to spirit takes from it that which distinguishes spirit from body; not a quality of bodies; for, if we attempt to conceive of it as such, we make it extension; but extension is precisely that quality in bodies which excludes space.

Consequently, space has no objective existence; consequently, it is purely ideal. We define it to be *the possibility of extended existence;* and possibility is not a thing, but an idea.

Objectively, space is nothing. Convenience of representation requires us to speak of it often in positive terms, as we do of other negatives; *e.g.*, of want and of death:

but all such expressions, if analyzed, will be found to have a negative significance. The reviewer himself makes space synonymous with vacuity. Now, it should seem that a vacuum is as near to nothing as thought can go. If a vacuum isn't nothing, then there is no nothing; and yet, in one view, a vacuum is a very positive thing; a vacuum will cause the death of any animal that is so unfortunate as to come within its limits.

In another place, our philosopher makes "all space" equivalent to "infinity," and "no space" equivalent to "nihility." It will be hard to make out any difference between the two that is not merely subjective. Take away God and the universe; and what remains — call it space, infinity, or what you like — is=0.

ADDRESS BEFORE THE MINISTERIAL UNION.

BY JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

Delivered in Arlington-Street Vestry, Feb. 13, 1865. — *Published by request.*

I HAVE been requested to introduce the discussion this morning with an address or essay on a subject which has recently attracted much attention among us; namely, the possibility of Christian and Ministerial Communion among those who differ as to the supernatural origin of Christianity.

If we put this subject into the form of a question, to be answered by a simple affirmative or negative, it may, perhaps, stand thus: "Can those who believe Christianity to be a supernatural revelation from God, authenticated by miracles, be in ministerial fellowship with those who deny to it any such supernatural or miraculous character?"

It is evident that this question is identical with that of creeds, as tests of fellowship. Those who say there can be no communion between supernaturalists and anti-supernaturalists assert the necessity of a creed as a test of fellowship, even though that creed shall consist only of a single article; viz., "I believe in the supernatural and miraculous origin of Christianity."

If it has become necessary to establish this test, it appears that the fathers of the Unitarian denomination were mistaken in their absolute opposition to creeds. They laid it down as a principle, that "Righteousness, and not belief, was the test of Christianity." They asserted that creeds rent asunder the Church of Christ, and that no difference of opinion should be allowed to divide those whose life showed equal sincerity, piety, and holiness. To this it was replied, that the principle was true, except as regarded fundamental doctrines, and that there should be no doctrinal test, except in regard to such vital points as the Trinity, atonement, total depravity, and eternal punishment. We replied, that we did not consider those points as vital, essential, or fundamental; that nothing was vital in Christianity but *faith in Christ;* and that whoever believed in Jesus as the Son of God ought to be considered a Christian, because this was the only test laid down in the Scriptures. As a matter of fact, we said, that all who confessed Jesus to be the Christ were baptized, and admitted to the Church; as, for example, the Ethiopian baptized by Philip. But our opponents replied, that this indeed was the only confession at first; but the reason was, that these words had then a definite meaning, which they have since lost; that to repeat a phrase to which no meaning is given, or different meanings are attached, cannot be the real foundation of Christianity; and that this phrase must be explained, in order to be adequate to this

end. We answered, that any explanation of the scriptural phrase was necessarily a human and fallible explanation; and that thus human opinions were made the reason for excluding Christians of good character from the Church of Christ, which was incurring the guilt of schism, and rending in twain the seamless robe of Jesus. To this they could only reply, that it was necessary, and due to the truth, thus to exclude heretics from Christian Communion. And so the argument has stood; the Orthodox resting on the *necessity of creeds* to prevent heresy, we on the evil of creeds as causing division and disunion among Christians.

Now, it appears, we are invited to make a creed ourselves, as a test of Christian fellowship, — a very short one, as I have said, but still a creed, and one not expressed in the language of the New Testament; for there is nothing about supernaturalism or anti-supernaturalism there. If we do this, we virtually leave the ground taken by our fathers, and admit that they were wrong and their opponents right as to the creed principle; we admit that creeds are necessary, and that the only question is of more or less.

Now, I do not like to leave the old denominational ground on which we have stood so long, and for which we have contended so often, unless I am compelled to by the power of fact and overwhelming reason. And I do not, as yet, see any such necessity. My opinion has always been, that the only hope for Christian union is in adopting the principle, that every honest man claiming to be a *Christian* ought to be treated as such. If a man does not claim to be a Christian, but calls himself a *Theist*, that is a different matter. I should not wish to call any one a Christian against his will. But if a man claims to be a Christian, and honestly thinks himself so, it seems

to me I am judging another man's servant, if I exclude him from the Christian community. And, by withdrawing my own fellowship from him, I do exclude him, just so far as I have the power to do it. Who am I, to judge another man's servant? To his own master he standeth or falleth.

But we owe, it is said, a duty to truth. We are bound to protest against error, important, vital error.

Granted: protest then against error, in every possible way. Argue against it. Oppose it. Refute it if you can. Preach sermons against it. Write articles against it in the "Christian Register," the "Christian Inquirer," the "Monthly Journal," the "Monthly Magazine," the "Christian Examiner;" and, if that is not enough, write a book against it. Cannot one deliver his soul in this way? But do not think to refute the error by excluding the man who holds it from your Christian fellowship or Christian society: that is another thing, altogether.

Dr. Johnson has a sophistical argument in defence of creeds, to this effect: "If a number of gentlemen wish to unite together in a club or society, may they not fix the terms of admission? And why has not a Church a right to do the same thing, and to establish what conditions of belief it pleases for membership?" The answer is, that, if a Church claims to be only a voluntary association, it *has* the right to make what conditions it will. But, if it claims to be a Church of Christ, then it has no right to put up any conditions but those which Christ himself has made.

But this may be a desperate case, requiring desperate remedies. What is it then? Let me begin by stating my own opinion.

I suppose that I am a supernaturalist, *pur sang*. I believe that God came to man in *two* ways, and not

merely one; viz., through Nature and from above Nature. Nature is the web of laws existing in us and around us. God comes to us through this Nature, showing himself in the magnificent order of the universe. The supernatural is whatever new impulse comes into this web *ab extra* or *a supra*. I agree with Dr. Bushnell, that, if man is a free being, every free act of his will is a supernatural act, not being the result of any cause before existing in the world. The creation of the world, and the creation of every tribe of animals or vegetables added to the world, were supernatural acts of Almighty Power. Each new race of animals folded down in the mammoth leaves of rock on which the geological history of the earth is written is the record of another supernatural act of the Almighty. So is every impulse coming to the human soul direct and immediate from the Infinite Spirit. I conceive the existence of Moses and the prophets — perhaps of Zoroaster and Confucius — better accounted for supernaturally than naturally. About them I may have doubt; but I have no doubt about Jesus. When he came, a new creative impulse touched the human race *a supra;* a flood of new life, not before in the nature of man, entered with Jesus into the world. That great stream which we call Christendom, having a special quality and power of life all its own, if we trace it to its source, came from Jesus of Nazareth. For four thousand years, men have lived on the banks of the Nile; and no one knew whence it came, till Captains Burton and Speke traced it to Lake Nyanza. But no one ever doubted that this fertilizing river, giving Egypt and its civilization to the world, came from some great and deep source. Christianity is such a river, flowing through eighteen centuries, having on its banks all their best thought, love, labor, fertilizing the human mind and heart, giving peace to life, and hope in

death. We trace it back, and find it issuing forth from Nazareth, from the heart and thought of one man; beginning with him; not traceable any farther, to any Jewish school or sect; not a result, but eminently and only a *cause*. Now that is, according to our definition, supernatural, the beginning of a new order of things.

"Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo."

This is my theory of Christ and Christianity, and I think it the most reasonable and philosophical. But here is another man, at least as wise as I am, who thinks otherwise. He thinks that God only comes to us in *one* way, not in *two* ways; only through Nature, only through the nexus of law. He does not believe in any new creation since the first: every thing which has since appeared was put into the great mundane egg. God has since satisfied himself by acting through Nature, and has never sent any fresh impulses of life into this great organism. No new great order of ages was integrated in the birth of Jesus; only the old one continued. But he believes in Jesus, just as I do, as the well-beloved Son of the Father; he takes his words as the sweetest and deepest in all history; he cools his parched lips at that sacred well, with that living water; he believes, that, were Jesus here, he would accept him as a true disciple; and he asks us to regard him as such, not for his sake only, but for the Master's sake, the truth's sake, for the sake of a world perishing amid the strife of creeds, for the sake of a Church torn by divisions, till its life is nearly gone.

Well: I dare not refuse. I think I should wound my Master again if I did. I should be false to the traditions of my Church. When God gave me my birth in this Church, and taught me the principles of Christian liberty by the lips of Henry Ware, Walker, and Channing, he

laid obligations on me. *Noblesse oblige.* We Unitarians belong to an hereditary nobility of freedom-lovers, who are bound to keep the unity of the spirit, not of the letter, in the bond of peace and of the largest brotherhood.

For myself, I see no logical ground to stand on, between this of giving Christian fellowship to every honest man who claims it, and that of refusing our fellowship to every one who does not agree with us on every point of Christian opinion. Do you say, "Oh! we will only insist on agreement in *essentials*"? But what part of Christian truth is unessential? Christian truth is not an *aggregate*, like a rock, of which a piece may be broken off, and the rest remain a perfect specimen still, of marble or of granite; but it is a living body, of which every part co-operates to the life of the whole. If you think any thing unessential, it is because you do not see the logical dependence of each part on every other.

But what right have I to introduce into my pulpit to instruct my people, a man whom I believe teaches pernicious error? Do not introduce him there at all: they will hear what he has to say, soon enough, in other ways. Ask no one into your pulpit whose services you think will not do good. If he is stupid, or bitter, or preaches too long sermons, or is too Calvinistic, or too poetical, or too prosaic, or too much of a heretic, do not exchange with him. No one asks you to do it. But, if we did, it would be no such strange thing; for, as Milton says, "it reflects to the disrepute of our ministers, and the proficiency which their flock reaps from them, if after all this light of the gospel, and all this continual preaching, their hearers should be such an unprincipled, unedified, and laic rabble, that the whiff of every new pamphlet or preacher should stagger them out of their catechism and Christian walking."

What we ask is, that we shall unite in all Christian works and Christian studies with good men who claim to be Christians. Do not you go out of the Church because they are in it. Don't be a come-outer; be a stay-iner. We need all tendencies in a Church; let one balance the other. A committee of Orthodox gentlemen waited on a certain governor, one day, to complain that he had appointed too many liberal men on the boards of the benevolent institutions of the State: they thought he ought to appoint more Orthodox men. "Perhaps you are right," said he: "next time I will appoint a Roman Catholic;" and he *did* so. Is it not barely possible, that God may have something to tell us by the lips of these brothers, to whom we affix this long name of *anti-supernaturalist*? It will do us no harm to hear what they have to say: it will do them no harm to hear what we have to say. Keep together, brethren; do not separate. "But will it not be thought that we hold the same ideas? and shall we not be giving them some support and countenance, if we continue mixed up with those who hold them?" Perhaps so; there will always be some fools in the world, who, if an Orthodox man be seen arm-in-arm with a Unitarian, will look on him with suspicion; as likely to be tainted with our heresy. I do not think it the best way to be watching these fools to keep them from making blunders about us. It is more manly to do what is right, and let God and his laws take care of one's reputation.

And, indeed, this popular method in the Church, of running away from error, locking it out, and separating from the errorist, does not seem to me the bravest or truest way of meeting it. If you think your brother is in error, go and talk with him; do not run away from him. If he will not hear you, then do not run away; but take one or two more, and talk with them. If they cannot convince him,

do not try to keep the Church from knowing about it; but *tell it* to the Church; and, if he will not hear the Church, then let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican. Yes: as a heathen man and a publican; for what is the Christian way of treating a heathen man and a publican? Is it to exclude him, to shut him out, to run away from him? By no means; but to run to him, and try to convert him. Do not missionaries run half round the world to find heathen to convert? and do we think to do our duty by shutting the errorist out, instead of inviting him in? "Though all the winds of doctrine," says Milton, "were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple: who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? Her *confuting* is the best and surest suppressing. I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, — that never sallies out and sees her adversary, but slinks out of the race, when that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat. When a man has been laboring the hardest labor in the deep mines of knowledge; hath furnished out his findings in all their equipage; drawn forth his reasons as it were a battle ranged; scattered and defeated all objections in his way; called out his adversary into the plain; offered him the advantage of wind and sun, only that he may try the matter by dint of argument, — for his opponents then to retire, is weakness in the war of truth. If the men be erroneous who are the leading schismatics, what withholds us but our sloth, that we do not give them gentle meetings and gentle dismissions; that we debate not, and examine the matter thoroughly with liberal and frequent audience, — if not for their sakes, yet for our own, — and have that high gift of wisdom, to answer solidly, or be convinced?"

VOICE FROM THE ARMY.—EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED.

"SINCE the receipt of your last letter, I have been stimulated to do more in the way of issuing tracts. The boys take them very thankfully. . . . I am much interested by what I see of chaplains and agents here. There seems to be a general breaking-up of sectarian lines."

"A friend having sent a copy of 'The Monthly Religious Magazine,' in which was a notice with your name thereto, I write to say, that a few of us, who wish to be purified, and girded with moral strength for whatever event may await us, will be very grateful for such reading-matter as in your judgment may do us good."

"I can profitably distribute just as many good books, of *all kinds*, as you can send me. To me, it seems that the West is the true field for Liberal seed. People have been fed on husks so long, and have seen so much dishonesty, disloyalty, and greed of gain, beneath a cloak of extreme sanctimoniousness, that many have learned to turn away in disgust from every thing bearing the name of religion. Our soldier boys, however, have acquired great skill in penetrating disguises; and the terms in which they denounce supposed Pharisees are any thing but mild. Much of the religious reading furnished them utterly fails of doing good. They grow weary of tracts with terrible warnings and queries on the cover: they have learned to be very brave, and will not be *frightened* into goodness. At the same time, their hearts are open to all truly holy and gentle influences. They all seem much pleased with the little books of the Unitarian Association. I wish somebody would donate a well-selected library of other books also (good histories, biographies, and works of

science, &c.) to our "Home." We are very anxious to make it a *true* "Home." Such reading is very much needed."

"The agents of the Christian Commission flood the hospitals with Orthodox tracts and children's papers: the noble-minded, intelligent soldiers crave something better. As an evidence of their appreciation of the literature you have sent, one to whom I had given tracts, &c., for distribution, related to me, that she gave them to the men of the —— Iowa, —— Missouri, —— Illinois, Regiments, just before the battle of Missionary Ridge. After these regiments had been in many battles, and marched many, many weary miles, some of them were again thrown into the hospital. She saw them reading, and said, 'Boys, where did you get your books?' 'They are those,' the men replied, 'which you gave us in Memphis, three months ago; and we have kept them ever since: and they are "bully" books, too!'"

"I confess to you, that I am not apt in this matter of distributing religious reading; I have little spirit for proselyting; but the publications of the American Unitarian Association are so broad and catholic, — so free from the haughty 'come-up-higher' spirit of the self-styled evangelists, that they at once strengthen and enlighten the feeble ones who are struggling out of darkness. My men, mostly brought up in the straiter sects, are prejudiced against religion; not distinguishing the true from the false. But approach them from the human side, not divorcing religion from common life; acknowledge mystery where there is mystery, not asking them to see it where it is not; let 'the Word' be again 'made flesh,' not sublimated into spiritual abstractions, — and you may expect that men in the flesh, with human feelings and passions, will listen to you. This I believe to be the method of your Association, and so would be glad to distribute its publications."

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS.

THE responses, thus far, to the call for one hundred thousand dollars, are most encouraging. Indeed, if we are not deceived by what we hear from our laymen, they are ripe for most generous and efficient action. They have met our appeal with cheerful, grateful alacrity. Give *cause*, and any sum would be raised. As we start for the first time on a scale somewhat in correspondence with the preciousness of our principles, and the abundance of our wealth, it is not strange that some timid yet generous men should fear that we shall not find judicious use for so large a sum. We have every thing to do to arrange the agencies for so large a work; but even now, in arranging these preliminary measures, the field opens wider and wider, and when we enter it and begin in earnest, who can anticipate what blessed opportunities God will grant us? By attempting to work, work comes; by looking, we see. When we pass the gate, we shall rejoice in the opening prospect.

The following statement will show how nobly the churches are coming up to the work: —

Dr. Bellows's Society, New York, paid	$5,246.47
Rev. Mr. Putnam's Society, Brooklyn (finished)	6,500.00
Rev. Mr. Hale's Society, Boston (finished)	5,000.00
Rev. Mr. Potter's Society, New Bedford, $1,000 subscribed, and $500, a contingent legacy, paid	1,500.00
Rev. Mr. Lowe's Society, Somerville, paid	725.00
Society in Lowell, over	750.00
Rev. Mr. Tilden's Society, Boston, over	750.00
Rev. Dr. Clarke's Society, Boston, commencing with promise	
Rev. Dr. Bartol's Society, Boston, over	1,400.00
Rev. Dr. Gannett's Society, Boston, over	5,000.00
Rev. Mr. Young's Society, Newton	1,600.00
Rev. Mr. Swan's Society, Kennebunk, Me.	400.00
	$28,871.47

The Association has now, it is believed, put itself in more or less direct communication with all the churches in our denomination; and we shall probably hear from them in due time. If any one has been overlooked, in the abundance of our communications, it is to be hoped that we shall be notified thereof, as it will be a pleasure to us to give such information as will enable them to gratify their generous feelings.

RUFUS P. STEBBINS,
Pres. A. U. A.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the one System of God. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New Edition. New York: Charles Scribner, 124, Grand Street. London: Sampson, Low, Son, & Co. 1864.

Broken Lights, an Inquiry into the Present Condition and Future Prospects of Religious Faith. By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Company. 1864.

These two books refer to the same general subject; but they are looked at from opposite sides, — Dr. Bushnell's from the side of Christianity, Miss Cobbe's from that of Naturalism. Both are able works; both written in a spirit of liberality toward the opposite side. They attempt to do justice to their opponents, and therefore do more justice to themselves.

Dr. Bushnell's work is a new edition, in a cheaper form, of one published some years ago. He says that his confidence in his argument is unshaken. He remarks that his book has not been noticed by naturalists, who take by assumption more than any other writers. Such men as Hennel, Parker, Strauss, and Rénan, dismiss Christian miracles without examination. Dr. Bushnell thinks, however, that the defenders of Christianity are much to blame for this, by their narrow theory of inspiration, their fantastic view of the supernatural, and their definition of miracles as suspension of the laws of nature. But especially

he laments that the defenders of Christian miracles should assume that miracles are now discontinued. He asserts that they are not, and has a chapter to that effect.

Dr. Bushnell defines the natural, as that which is going on by itself, or that system of things which is being developed according to its own laws; and the supernatural, as that which comes in to nature from the outside. Creation, therefore, was a supernatural fact; and man himself has in him, not only nature, but something above nature, or supernatural. Man re-acts upon nature from the domain of his will made free by his reason.

Nature never made a pistol or fired it; which, being done, we hang the criminal for what is rightly called his unnatural deed.

Dr. Bushnell starts with the fact of sin, which he considers as inexplicable out of any thing previously existing. He does not consider Satan or the Devil to be a real being, but a name given to bad persons and spirits taken together. Naturalism denies the fact of sin, and considers it only as mistake; but Dr. Bushnell maintains, that sin is not only spiritual or wilful denial of good, but dynamic, — that is, evil organizing itself in nature, and transmitting itself along with the laws of nature. He also has a chapter on what he calls Anticipative Consequences of Sin. Sin, which is an all-penetrating sacrament of woe, raises storms of retribution against itself; and nature answers to it with groans. The geologic world was full of disorder, battle, and pain long before man arrived. He quotes Mr. Agassiz, as speaking of prophetic types of things to come, and of "Premeditation prior to Creation." Sin, therefore, is a bad miracle, producing unnature as its grand result; and there is no remedy for this in development, which is the gospel of Naturalism.

All this prepares the way for the introduction of the supernatural, or God coming into nature anew, creating a new series of laws from time to time. That such a new series began with Christ, is argued from his perfect character as well as his miracles; his character itself being the greatest miracle.

The peculiarity and great merit of Dr. Bushnell's work is, that it plants the supernatural in nature itself, and shows it at work before the world was, — at work now, and to work always. In identifying the supernatural with creation, and in making man, as a free being, a creator, and so supernatural also, Dr. Bushnell, we think, has taken the true ground, and laid the proper foundation of a philosophical supernatural theory. Whatever other book the theologian may dispense with, he can do without this one.

"Broken Lights" is another book also deserving the closest study. It is written by Miss Cobbe, a disciple of Theodore Parker. It discusses calmly, and with no spirit of antagonism,

the different forms of religious opinions in England. She states the great problem to be the question between intuitive and derived religion, or between tradition and rationalism. She considers that we must stand either on revelation or on reason ultimately. She admits that traditional religion is indispensable for the religious education of the world. Not until piety shall permeate the spirit of the age can the world afford, she says, to dispense with the Church. Examining the position of different parties, she first looks at the High Church, which is on the extreme right, next to the Church of Rome, holding the sacramental and priestly theories of religion, and taking for its creed the Bible as authenticated and interpreted by the Church. There is a class of minds instinctively attracted by such a claim, to whom some external authority, clothed with the dignity of age, is a great comfort. But, criticising the basis of this theory, she finds it wholly untenable, and declares that the High Church cannot be the Church of the future.

Looking next at the Low Church, she finds it adapted to a much larger class of minds, — those in whom feeling preponderates over thought; but decides also, that this cannot be the Church of the future. So she turns to the Broad Church, which she divides into two schools, — the first, that originating with Coleridge and Arnold, of which Kingsley and Maurice are leaders; and the second made known by the book called "Essays and Reviews," of which Jowett, the Professor of Greek, at Oxford, is the leader. The formula of the first is the Bible and the Church, both interpreted by reason. Finding many things to praise in this Broad Church, she applies to it a criticism which leaves it very little to stand upon. In its attempt to reconcile authority and reason, it evades every special difficulty. What she calls the Second Broad Church goes much further, and teaches, that the inspiration of the Bible differs in degree, but not in kind, from that of other books. It treats all other subjects in a much wider way; teaching the most advanced theology, and, at the same time, a warm personal religion. It calls us to rest our faith on history, but on history confirmed by consciousness, and not opposed to it. Miss Cobbe also criticises the Unitarians, Bishop Colenso, the "Life of Jesus" by Rénan, and then passes on to consider the future prospects of religious faith. She does not think that any historic religion will remain: she believes that Christianity itself will come to an end, and the faith of the future become pure Theism, consisting in three doctrines, — the absolute goodness of God, the final salvation of every created soul, and the divine authority of conscience.

But Miss Cobbe differs from most of those who reject Christianity, in her strong faith in prayer, her demand for fervent piety and active charity. She objects to that kind of Theism

which gives up prayer, as the loss of almost every thing essential. She thinks that prayer reveals to us the personality of God, and that, without it, man becomes a Pantheist, and God becomes nothing but the unconscious nature of things. Miss Cobbe also believes in the sinfulness of sin, and says that the depth and the vigor of the whole religious life depend on the intensity of this feeling. She even indorses the saying, that it is in the sense of sin that the finite creature must first approach to the infinite holiness of God; and she declares, that the emotions of penitence are the most sacred of any. Every true emotion, she says, springs from this sense, — that we have sinned, and are pardoned. "This alone places us in the right attitude; and without it, from beginning to end, we are in a false position."

Miss Cobbe also declares, that Theists have utterly failed by not sympathizing with the mass of men. She criticises both Emerson and Carlyle for their intolerance in this respect, and says, that the humblest and narrowest Christianity, which teaches us that all souls belong to God, is better than this.

If any one desires to study the questions now at issue between Theism and Christianity, he cannot find them better stated and argued than in these two books, by Dr. Bushnell and Miss Cobbe.

We do not think the result will be that Christianity is to pass away, or be merged in Theism. On the contrary, Miss Cobbe's book must itself tend to convince us that her Theism is not a practical thing, and cannot subsist long outside of Christianity.

The Blade and the Ear. Thoughts for a Young Man. By A. B. Muzzey. Boston: William V. Spencer, 134, Washington Street. 1865.

This book contains ten chapters on the following subjects: Introduction; The Young Man at Home; Our Young Men the Hope of the Lord; Basis of Success; Moral Dangers; Recreations; Female Society; Books and Reading; The Bible, — why to be read; Moral Preventives.

The object of this book, as these titles show, is to inculcate on young men those virtues which will make them useful citizens, and make their lives happy. It inculcates honesty, temperance, industry, purity, healthy exercise, good companions, judicious reading; and warns them against the tendencies to the opposite evils. We should think it a very useful book to be put into the hands of young men.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Feb. 13, 1865. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Kidder, Hedge, Clarke, Brigham, Barrett, Hinckley, Lowe, Hale, Sawyer, Smith, and Fox.

The Finance Committee reported, that there was now good reason to think that the $100,000 would be very soon raised, — nearly $20,000 having been already collected in six societies.

They further reported, that Dr. Stebbins, a few days after the last meeting, had accepted the proposition made, and had since given his whole time to the work of the Association. By their request, Dr. Stebbins then stated to the Board what steps had been taken to obtain contributions from societies, and what, thus far, had been the results.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence presented an application for aid from the new society in Montpelier, Vt.; and, in accordance with their recommendation, an appropriation was made of $100.

Mr. Hale stated, that he had been requested to ask for aid for the new society in Milford, Mass.; and, on motion made by him, the application was referred to the Committee on New-England Correspondence.

The Committee on Western Correspondence reported, that a communication had been received from the Mission Committee of the Western Conference, stating, that the society in Fond du Lac, Wis., would require further aid, to the amount of $100, to carry them through the year; and proposing, that the Association appropriate an additional $50, with the understanding, that the Western Conference do the same. The Committee recommended that the appropriation be made, and their report was adopted.

The Committee on Publications reported in favor of presenting, in response to applications received, a copy of each of the publications of the Association, to the Town Library in Westford, Mass., and the Parish Library of the new society in Montpelier, Vt.; which report was adopted.

The President having stated, that, in consequence of the resignation of Mr. Winkley as a member of the Board, there was a vacancy on the India-Mission Committee, Mr. Hale was unanimously elected to fill the vacancy.

The Army-Mission Committee reported, that they had nearly exhausted the $1,500 placed at their disposal at the December meeting, while the opportunities for circulating reading-matter among the soldiers had greatly increased; and, in compliance with their request, they were authorized to draw from the treasury $5,000 to carry on this work.

This Committee also reported in favor of an appropriation of $25 to aid in the circulation of "The Soldiers' Journal," a paper published by Miss Amy M. Bradley, at Alexandria, Va.; and their report was adopted.

Mr. Hale, in behalf of the Committee appointed to call the New-York Convention, made a brief report of what had been done by them, and asked for an appropriation to pay for printing, and other necessary expenses; which request was referred to the Finance Committee, with full powers.

After the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned to Monday, March 13.

INTELLIGENCE.

Rev. JOSEPH FIELD, D.D., of Weston, Mass., having completed his fiftieth year as pastor of the society in that place, the occasion was celebrated on Wednesday, Feb. 1. The exercises in the church commenced at 12 M., and were as follows:

Reading from the Scriptures, by Rev. Thomas Hill, D.D., of Cambridge; prayer by Rev. Joseph Allen, D.D., of Northborough; sermon by the pastor; original hymn; address by Rev. Edmund H. Sears, of Wayland; hymn; prayer by Rev. John B. Wight, of Wayland; benediction. After the services in the church, there was a festival at the Town Hall, attended by the members of the society, and invited guests, at which addresses were made by Rev. Drs. Allen and Hill, and Rev. George E. Ellis, D.D., of Charlestown, Rev. Frederic Hinckley, of Boston, and Rev. Leonard J. Livermore, of Lexington. Dr. Field has resigned his office as pastor of the society, but has been requested to retain at least a nominal senior pastorship, while they will at once relieve him from the responsibilities he has so long and faithfully discharged.

Rev. FREDERIC HINCKLEY has accepted an invitation to take charge of the Hawes-Place Society, South Boston, for one year.

Rev. C. G. HOWLAND, of Tremont, Ill., has accepted a call from the society in Kalamazoo, Mich.

Rev. H. C. DUGAN, of Franklin, N.H., has accepted a call from the society at Feltonville, Mass.

Mr. GEORGE N. RICHARDSON, of Eastport, Me., has accepted a call from the society in Westborough, Mass.

Rev. CHARLES T. CANFIELD has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society in Bernardston, Mass., for one year.

Rev. FREDERIC W. HOLLAND has been invited to preach at Rochester, N.Y., for the purpose of re-organizing the Unitarian Society in that place.

Rev. JOHN K. KARCHER has resigned the charge of the society in Nantucket, Mass.

Rev. COURTLAND Y. DE NORMANDIE, of Fairhaven, has declined the call from the society in Marlborough, Mass.

Rev. JOHN M. MARSTERS has declined the call from the society in Walpole, N.H., and has accepted a call from his former society at North Cambridge, Mass.

THE NEW-YORK CONVENTION. — The Committee appointed at the Special Meeting of the American Unitarian Association "to call a convention, to consist of the pastor and two delegates from each church or parish in the Unitarian denomination, to meet in the city of New York," have fixed upon Wednesday, April 5, as the day on which the convention shall meet; and have sent circulars to all the societies of the denomination, inviting them to send delegates. The convention will be held at All Souls' Church.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1865.			
Jan.	18.	From Society in West Cambridge, as a donation . .	$80.00
„	20.	„ Society in Jamaica Plain, as a donation . . .	172.00
„	20.	„ Thomas Brown, for India Mission	5.00
„	23.	„ Rev. T. B. Forbush and Rev. G. G. Withington, as annual memberships	2.00
„	25.	„ Society in Saco, Me., as a donation, additional	37.00
„	25.	„ Miss S. W. Moore, Miss M. H. Moore, and Geo. Hutchings, as annual memberships . . .	3.00
„	25.	„ subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Marblehead	6.00
„	26.	„ Rev. W. G. Babcock, as an annual membership	1.00
„	27.	„ Barton-Square Society, Salem, for Monthly Journals	36.55
„	28.	„ a lady at South Hadley Falls, for Army Fund	5.00
„	28.	„ Society in West Roxbury, for Monthly Journals	17.00
„	31.	„ Society in Shirley, for Monthly Journals . .	10.00
„	31.	„ Society in Wayland, for Monthly Journals, additional	2.00
Feb.	1.	„ Society in Troy, N.Y., as a donation	100.00
„	1.	„ S. G. Simpkins, as a donation	10.00
„	1.	„ Society in Chicopee, for Monthly Journals . .	11.00
„	1.	„ Rev. Nathaniel Hall's Society, Dorchester, for Monthly Journals, additional	3.00
„	2.	„ subscribers to Monthly Journal, in Barnstable	3.00
„	3.	„ Alfred Huidekoper, of Meadville, Penn., to make Rev. Richard Metcalf a life-member . . .	30.00
„	3.	„ Charles A. Stevens, of Ware, to make himself a life-member	30.00
„	3.	„ North Society, Salem, for Monthly Journals, additional	5.00
„	3.	„ Society in Kalamazoo, Mich., for Monthly Journals	10.00
„	6.	„ Society in Groton, as a donation, additional .	1.00
„	7.	„ Society in Brooklyn, Conn., as a donation . .	17.00
„	7.	„ ladies of the Church of the Unity, Worcester, to make their pastor, Rev. R. R. Shippen, a life-member	30.00

Feb.	7.	From a friend, for Army Fund		5.00
„	7.	„ Society in Dover, N.H., for Monthly Journals		14.50
„	7.	„ Society in Leominster, for Monthly Journals		22.56
„	7.	„ Society in Manchester, N.H., for Monthly Journals		18.30
„	8.	„ a friend, as a donation		5.00
„	8.	„ M. T. Rice and William Rice, as annual memberships		2.00
„	10.	„ Society in Peterborough, N.H., as a donation		31.00
„	10.	„ Rev. J. C. Parsons, and Rev. C. B. Ferry, as annual memberships		2.00
„	11.	„ Society in New Bedford, as a donation, including $60 from Jos. C. Delano, to make himself and Rev. William J. Potter, life-members, and also life-memberships for David R. Greene, Ed. C. Jones, and Mrs. Sophia B. Thornton	1,000.00	
		Also, a legacy left by Charles W. Morgan, deceased, of New Bedford, future and contingent, paid now in full by Mrs. C. W. Morgan, and William J. Rotch, executor	500.00	
				1,500.00
„	11.	„ Society in Plymouth, for Monthly Journals		16.00
„	13.	„ subscribers to Monthly Journals in Littleton		3.00
„	14.	„ Society in Littleton, for Army Fund		13.50
„	14.	„ Rev. Dr. Briggs's Society, Salem, for Monthly Journals, additional		1.00
„	17.	„ Society in Brookfield, for Monthly Journals		16.00
„	18.	„ Mrs. Frances L. Wilson, Framingham, as a donation, including $30 to make herself a life-member		50.00
„	18.	„ members of the Society in Albany, N.Y., to make their pastor, Rev. Charles G. Ames, a life-member		30.00
„	18.	„ Rev. C. G. Howland, of Kalamazoo, Mich., to make himself a life-member		30.00
„	18.	„ William Wightman, St. Louis, Mo., to make Rev. C. A. Staples, of Milwaukee, Wis., a life-member		30.00
„	18.	„ Rev. Dr. Bellows's Society, New York, as a donation		5,246.47
„	20.	„ Mrs. L. P. Wood, of Springfield, Ill., as a donation, including $30 to make Mrs. Lucian Tilton a life-member		42.50
„	20.	„ Society in Somerville, as a donation, including $30 from Cutler Downer, to make Rev. Charles Lowe a life-member, and $30 from E. R. Sawyer, to make Henry F. Spencer a life-member.		725.00
„	21.	„ Society in Mendon, to make their pastor, Rev. William T. Phelan, a life-member		30.00

CORRECTION. — The $30 acknowledged last month as from "friends in Greenfield, to make Rev. J. K. Hosmer a life-member," was from "friends in *Deerfield*."